

Appl. No. : 10/619,938
Filed : July 15,2003

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the personal interview conducted May 17, 2007 with the Applicants' attorney Drew Hamilton. Claims 1-30, 36-46, and 51 are pending. Claims 31-35 and 48-50 were previously canceled. Claims 47, 52, and 53 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 24, 36, and 51 are amended herein. The amendments to Claims 1, 36, and 51 correspond to the amendments that the Applicants' attorney proposed at the interview.

Responses to Rejections

The Examiner rejected all pending claims. The Applicants traverse the rejections as follows:

Written Description: Claims 1-30 and 36-46

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 and 36-46 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner specifically objected to the phrase "without user initiation." The rejection is moot because the Applicants have amended the claims to remove the phrase "without user initiation." The Applicants submit that these are not narrowing amendments.

Enablement: Claims 1-30 and 36-46

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 and 36-46 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner specifically objected to the phrase "without user initiation." The rejection is moot because the Applicants have amended the claims to remove the phrase "without user initiation." The Applicants submit that these are not narrowing amendments.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-30 and 51 as allegedly omitting an essential step of "generating a search engine query." The Applicants do not agree but have nevertheless amended the rejected claims to expedite prosecution and allowance of this application. The Applicants reserve all rights to pursue claims that omit the step of "generating a search engine query."

Indefiniteness: Claims 1-30, 36-46, 51, and 52

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 and 51 as allegedly being indefinite for omitting the allegedly essential step of generating a search engine query. The Applicants do not agree that the step is essential but have nevertheless amended the rejected claims to expedite prosecution and

Appl. No. : 10/619,938
Filed : July 15,2003

allowance of this application. The Applicants reserve all rights to pursue claims that omit the step of generating a search engine query.

The Examiner rejected Claims 24 and 25 because "the appeal" recited in Claim 24 lacks antecedent basis. The Applicants have amended Claim 24 to depend from Claim 21 instead of Claim 20 and to thus correct the lack of antecedent basis. The Applicants submit that the amendment is simply a correction of an error of dependency and is not a narrowing amendment.

The Examiner rejected Claims 36-46 and 52 because "the final question" recited in Claim 36 lacks antecedent basis. The Applicants have amended Claim 36 to replace "the final question" with "the subsequent question." The Applicants submit that the amendment is simply a correction of an error and is not a narrowing amendment. The rejection of Claim 52 is moot because the Applicants have canceled this claim.

Anticipation: Claims 36, 37, 40, 42-44, and 52

The Examiner rejected Claims 36, 37, 40, 42-44, and 52 as allegedly anticipated by the Ruppelt patent. As discussed at the interview, the Ruppelt patent does not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 36. For example, the Ruppelt patent does not teach at least the limitation of "presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user." Accordingly Claim 36 is allowable. Claims 37, 40, and 42-44 are allowable at least because they depend from and incorporate the limitations of Claim 36. The Applicants submit that Claims 37, 40, and 42-44 are further allowable in view of their additional limitations. The rejection of Claim 52 is moot because the Applicants canceled this claim.

Obviousness: Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10-12, 17, 18, 30, and 51

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10-12, 17, 18, 30, and 51 as allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent and the Friedman patent. As discussed at the interview, the Ruppelt patent and the Friedman patent in combination do not teach or make obvious every limitation of the amended Claims 1 and 51. For example, with respect to Claim 1, neither the Ruppelt patent nor the Friedman patent teaches at least the limitation of "presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user." Neither the Ruppelt patent nor the Friedman patent teaches at least the limitation "at least some of the plurality of online sites are located remotely from and are functionally independent from a site providing the questions." Accordingly, Claims 1 and 51 are allowable. Claims 2, 4, 5,

Appl. No. : 10/619,938
Filed : July 15,2003

10-12, 17, 18, and 30 are allowable at least because they depend from and incorporate the limitations of Claim 1. The Applicants submit that Claims 2, 4, 5, 10-12, 17, 18, and 30 are further allowable in view of their additional limitations.

Obviousness: Claims 14, 15, and 20

The Examiner rejected Claims 14, 15, and 20 as allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent, the Friedman patent, the Ho patent, and the Bookman publication. As discussed at the interview, the combined prior art does not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 1 from which Claims 14, 15, and 20 depend. For example, the combined prior art does not teach at least the limitation of "presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user." Accordingly, Claims 14, 15, and 20 are allowable at least because they depend from and incorporate the limitations of Claim 1. The Applicants submit that Claims 14, 15, and 20 are further allowable in view of their additional limitations.

Obviousness: Claim 21

The Examiner rejected Claim 21 as allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent, the Friedman patent, the Ho patent, and the Rebane patent. As discussed at the interview, the combined prior art does not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 1 from which Claim 21 indirectly depends. For example, the combined prior art does not teach at least the limitation of "presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user." Accordingly, 21 is allowable at least because it depends from and incorporates the limitations of Claim 1. The Applicants submit that Claim 21 is further allowable in view of its additional limitations.

Obviousness: Claims 22 and 23

The Examiner rejected Claims 22 and 23 allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent, the Friedman patent, the Ho patent, the Rebane patent, and the Galperin patent. As discussed at the interview, the combined prior art does not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 1 from which Claims 22 and 23 depend. For example, the combined prior art does not teach at least the limitation of "presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user." Accordingly, Claims 22 and 23 are allowable at least because they depend from and incorporate the limitations of Claim 1. The

Appl. No. : 10/619,938
Filed : July 15,2003

Applicants submit that Claims 22 and 23 are further allowable in view of their additional limitations.

Obviousness: Claims 8, 9, 16, 24-26, and 29

The Examiner rejected Claims 8, 9, 16, 24-26, and 29 as allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent, the Friedman patent, the Ho patent, and the August patent. As discussed at the interview, the combined prior art does not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 1 from which Claims 8, 9, 16, 24-26, and 29 depend. For example, the combined prior art does not teach at least the limitation of “presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user.” Accordingly, Claims 8, 9, 16, 24-26, and 29 are allowable at least because they depend from and incorporate the limitations of Claim 1. The Applicants submit that Claims 8, 9, 16, 24-26, and 29 are further allowable in view of their additional limitations.

Obviousness: Claim 38

The Examiner rejected Claim 38 as allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent and the Sassano patent. As discussed at the interview, the Ruppelt patent and the Sassano patent in combination do not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 36 from which Claim 38 indirectly depends. For example, neither the Ruppelt patent nor the Sassano patent teaches at least the limitation of “presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user.” Accordingly, Claim 38 is allowable at least because it depends from and incorporates the limitations of Claim 36. The Applicants submit that Claim 38 is further allowable in view of its additional limitations.

Obviousness: Claims 39, 41, 45, and 46

The Examiner rejected Claims 39, 41, 45, and 46 as allegedly being obvious in view of the Ruppelt patent, the Ho patent, and the Bookman publication. As discussed at the interview, the combined prior art does not teach every limitation of the amended Claim 36 from which Claims 39, 41, 45, and 46 depend. For example, the combined prior art does not teach at least the limitation of “presenting to a user at least one webpage that has at least one function unrelated to receiving answers from the user.” Accordingly, Claims 39, 41, 45, and 46 are allowable at least because they depend from and incorporate the limitations of Claim 36. The

Appl. No. : 10/619,938
Filed : July 15,2003

Applicants submit that Claims 39, 41, 45, and 46 are further allowable in view of their additional limitations.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that all pending Claims are allowable over the prior art of record and respectfully request such allowance.

If any issues remain, the Applicants request that the Examiner call the Applicants' undersigned attorney at his direct line of (949) 721-2897.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated:

5/24/2007

By:

Ted M. Cannon

Ted M. Cannon
Registration No. 55,036
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

3798037
052207